LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour. Editor, R. Palme Dutt.

MR. BEVIN'S FOREIGN POLICY

K. Zilliacus, M.P.

TEN POINTS FOR THE TRADE UNION CONFERENCE ON MAN-POWER

UNITY, THEN AND NOW — *John Horner*

A SQUARE DEAL FOR WOMEN — *Bert Papworth*

THE INVESTMENT BILL — *J. Winter*

INDIA AND PAKISTAN — *R. Palme Dutt*

KARL MARX 1818—1883

March 1946 . . . 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVIII. No. 3

CONTENTS

March, 1946

Page

Notes of the Month—*Ten Points for the Trade Union Conference on Man-Power* by R. P. D. 65

Mr. Bevin and British Foreign Policy by K. ZILLIACUS 71

Unity, Then and Now by JOHN HORNER 75

A Square Deal for Women by BERT PAPWORTH 78

The Investment Bill by J. WINTER 81

India and Pakistan by R. PALME DUTT 83

Karl Marx, 1818—1883 94

Book Reviews—

Small Beer Chronicles by A. R. 95

A Pre-War Pole by Q. ; Cambridge by C.P.D. ; 96

Literary Essays by A.C.M. ; Shorter Notices 96

Quadrupling Our Exports

Between August, 1944, and January, 1946, exports of the LABOUR MONTHLY have increased from 875 to 3,500 copies.

We are sure that Sir Stafford Cripps will be pleased to hear that the LABOUR MONTHLY is thus doing its best to assist his efforts. If every British industry could show a similar record it is evident that the problem of British exports would be already solved.

We have been happy to receive a special allocation of paper for export additional to our regular home supply, so that the home market is not robbed. We have now consumed this special allocation and are applying for more.

Readers will be interested in the distribution of the overseas sales of the LABOUR MONTHLY. This shows that the greatest numbers go to the English-speaking countries, namely the United States of America and the Dominions. Australia alone takes 500 copies regularly. The countries of Asia, especially India and the Middle East, come next with nearly 1,500 copies. Europe so far takes a much smaller proportion; but even in this continent 750 copies go regularly to Greece.

This extension of the distribution of the LABOUR MONTHLY over the world is only made possible by our extreme light-weight production which, however technically inconvenient, makes possible an enormous extension of our circulation, despite limitation of paper supplies, to meet at any rate some of the demand.

When next you are inclined to curse at blue paper and microscopic type, remember those 750 readers in Greece who are only able to get their copies thanks to your "austerity" in submitting to these restrictions.

But we hope in the near future to be able to improve the format and are engaged in a number of experiments for a light airmail white paper as a first step forward.

REPRODUCED BY UNIVERSITY OF
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

TEN POINTS

For the Trade Union Conference on Man-Power

On March 6 the Conference of Trade Union Executives, convened by the Government, meets to consider the urgent problems of man-power.

ON all sides there is at last a growing awakening to the gravity of the present emergency and of the economic situation of post-war Britain, which the popular movement and the Government elected by the vote of the people will have the task to grapple with and overcome.

Food, coal, agriculture, house-building, the basic industries and new equipment, demobilisation and man-power, foreign trade and foreign exchange—these are all interlocked aspects of a common problem which can only be tackled on the basis of a common plan. Even the assumption of the American loan has been thrown into doubt by the present controversy in the United States, and the most ardent advocates of the argument of "no alternative" have been considering the alternative. The American loan itself, however, if we may assume its ultimate adoption, could only give a very short breathing space, and in no wise diminishes the urgency of reconstruction in Britain.

THE unscrupulous propaganda campaign of Toryism, which seeks to treat the difficulties of the present situation as the consequence of the Labour Government, is as contemptible as the previous transparent cheap tactics of their ill-fated general election campaign. It is obvious that the difficulties of the present situation, inherited by the Labour Government, are the climax of a whole era of prolonged capitalist decline in Britain, under almost continuous Tory rule. The tricks of the Tory cheapjacks have not carried conviction, as the still rising figure of the Labour vote in by-elections has shown. The people have no confidence in Toryism. But they are deeply anxious over the position and concerned that the plans and policies adopted shall be adequate to meet the emergency.

READERS in this country of Stalin's speech of February 9 must have felt a pang of envy at the difference of the record and perspective there set out. The Soviet Union has had to face losses and destruction in the war, both of man-power and resources, on a scale which leaves our losses by comparison negligible. But the Soviet people are able to face the future with a confidence, a clearness of common purpose and a singleness of aim, such as no other nation can touch; they have no fear of economic crisis or unemployment, such as haunts the thoughts of the people of the United States and Britain; they can set before themselves clear and publicly proclaimed targets of production and rising standards such as would seem fantastic in any other country. Already the past record reveals the difference. It is only necessary to consider the figures of Britain in the main branches of production between 1913 and 1938 (the last peace year) and those of the Soviet Union between 1913 and 1940 to see the difference between a declining capitalist country and an advancing socialist country:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNITED KINGDOM PRODUCTION, 1913-1938

(in millions of tons)

	1913	1938	*Increase or Decrease*
Coal	287	230	Decrease 20 per cent.
Pig Iron	10.2	6.8	Decrease 33 per cent.
Steel	7.6	10.5	Increase 27 per cent.

U.S.S.R. PRODUCTION, 1913-1940

(in millions of tons)

	1913	1940	*Increase*
Coal	29	166	Increase 472 per cent.
Pig Iron	4.2	15	Increase 257 per cent.
Steel	4.2	18.3	Increase 335 per cent.

Similarly with the targets set for the Soviet Union to reach 500 million tons for the production of coal, 50 million tons for pig iron, and 60 million tons for steel.

THIS is the contrast between a capitalist and a socialist country. Britain is still a capitalist country, with all the limitations of monopoly capitalism in an advanced stage of decay. The people, by defeating the Tories at the polls and voting Labour, have shown their desire for social and economic change. The Labour legislative programme, with several major measures of nationalisation, represents an important programme of democratic reforms, but not yet of socialist change. Hence the present immediate problems have to be met within a monopoly capitalist Britain, but with a Government based on the organised labour movement and pledged to a programme of democratic planning in the interests of the masses of the people.

THE Labour Government does not bear the responsibility for the causes of the present situation. But the Labour Government and the organised working-class movement has the primary responsibility to tackle the situation and to lead the people in carrying through the necessary drastic measures to speed the change-over from war to peace, fulfil Britain's part in international co-operation, build up production and speed the standard of living. Recent disquieting developments, the obvious mishandling of ministerial pronouncements over food and lack of foresight in accepting the Tory retrograde policy on agriculture, the uncertainty of targets in the field of industrial production, the growing pools of unemployment in the old depressed areas, especially South Wales and Scotland, the lavish basis of compensation in relation to nationalisation, the weakness of control in relation to investment and monopoly interests, and the heavy fall in the general level of earnings of the workers, have given rise to serious concern and questioning in the ranks of Labour supporters as to whether the Government has any adequate overall economic plan to meet the situation. This concern has been intensified by the continuity of a Tory foreign policy, which is not only anti-democratic, anti-Soviet and dangerous to peace, but obviously contrary to the plain and urgent requirements of reconstruction at home. Lack of confidence in policy adversely affects production, and weakens the drive and inspiration of a common advance which the present position requires.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT is in this situation that the Conference of Trade Union Executives on man-power can play a very important part. The Conference of Trade Union Executives, while not directly including the men from the workshops and shop stewards, the key men for any production drive, does represent more directly and on a far wider range the organised working-class than the Labour Party, as well as on a united basis without those artificial divisions and exclusion of the militant section which vitiate the representative character of the leadership and discussion of policy in the Labour Party. Hence the Conference will be able, not only to hear the pronouncements from Government Ministers, but also to make representations, raise issues and put forward proposals and suggestions on behalf of the six and a half millions of organised trade unionism.

Accordingly it may be useful to suggest a few of the issues and proposals which might be profitably considered at the Conference.

1. **Man-power and Demobilisation.** It is stated that Ministers will report an urgent shortage of man-power of one million. Yet the last return for the end of 1945 shows nearly four millions in the armed forces. The revised demobilisation figures published on February 14, with a planned slow-down of the rate of demobilisation from 100,000 a week in the latter part of 1945 to an average of 75,000 a week for the first half of 1946, would leave 1,681,100 by June, with additions for new intake, representing 175,000 in the second half of 1945 and an unstated figure for the first half of 1946, and bringing the total in the neighbourhood of two millions for June. The *Daily Herald* of February 18 reports that there are one and a half millions British armed forces overseas. How many of these are being used for sustaining the reactionary regime in Greece, for war in Indonesia, for the reported half million in the Middle East, for holding down India and Burma and Malaya? Could not a million be cut here and restored to civilian life and the urgent needs of production, if a democratic foreign policy were followed? Is not the heart of the man-power problem Mr. Bevin?

2. **Woman-power.** The number of women recorded in the working population (including the auxiliary services), which stood at 5,094,000 in June, 1939, and rose to 7,253,000 in June, 1943, had fallen to 6,321,000 in November, 1945, and has since fallen further. This means that nearly half the wartime advance of two and a quarter millions has been lost. If there is any serious desire to maintain the maximum working power of the nation, why are women being sacked wholesale from industry, even when they wish to stay on? Why are private firms, local authorities and statutory undertakings like the London Passenger Transport Board allowed to announce a policy of sacking women employees and taking on men to replace them? Is the employers' policy of forcing women back to low-paid jobs to take precedence of the national need for the fullest use of their wartime skills and training for maximum production?

3. **Production Plan.** Has the Government any general production plan for the fullest use of the nation's resources and man-power in relation to the different branches of industry, priority of needs and programme for expansion; or is there only a miscellany of specific, partial, detailed and unrelated plans in different fields, with the conflicting pull of different interests and sectional aims? The Memorandum of the Engineering Unions to the Ministry of Supply, advocating an Engineering Advisory Board, and showing the needs in relation to any plans for expansion and modernisa-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion for a whole series of industries and agriculture, sharply reveals the importance of this key question. The Control of Investment Bill, with its very limited scope, is far from fulfilling the need of a planned programme of capital investment for the modernisation and expansion of British industry and productive efficiency.

4. **Expansion of Home Market.** What is the relation of the export drive to the need for the expansion of the home market and increased production of goods for home consumption? Is the export drive conceived as based on austerity and restriction of the home market, as some ministerial speeches would appear to suggest? The expansion of the home market is not only important for the full use of increased productive power and full employment, which is the indispensable economic basis for lower overhead costs and cheapening export prices. It is also important that there should be a rapid increased flow of consumption goods to provide the incentive for raising production, the drive for which cannot be sustained only by exhortatory speeches plus austerity. On this point Ellis Smith was undoubtedly right. Incidentally, Stalin's speech has shown how clearly this key question is understood in the Soviet plans for raising production.

5. **National Wages Policy.** The Government has so far resisted the demand for a national wages policy. This demand comes from opposing quarters. The employers and financial press demand a national wages policy in the sense of pegging existing rates and preventing increases, supposedly on the grounds of fear of inflation in view of the shortage of goods. This is fantastically contrary to the real situation. In fact, a wholesale cut in the earnings of the workers has been taking place for the past year and a half. Between July, 1944, and January, 1945, the recorded figure of earnings showed already a drop of three shillings and since then the fall has been much greater.* What is needed is a national wage policy, sponsored by the Government, for higher wages to offset the decrease in earnings and correspond to increased productivity, with a general minimum of £4 10s. and special emphasis for increases in the low-paid industries, whose expansion, though of national importance, as in textiles, is being throttled by low wages and unsatisfactory conditions.

6. **Home Food Production.** The critical food situation will require drastic measures to limit luxury feeding and deal with the black market. But the main question is the extension of home food production. The Tory attacks on the Labour Minister of Agriculture for lack of foresight in permitting the decline of wheat production are laughable, since it was the Tory Minister of Agriculture who from the beginning of 1945 initiated the retrograde policy of throwing away the gains of wartime expansion of agriculture and returning to the pre-war basis; and the Labour Minister was only guilty of continuing the Tory policy. During 1945 the wheat acreage was allowed to fall by 950,000 acres, or over half the wartime gain of 1,700,000 acres; and a further drop in 1946 was planned. Yet the Hot Springs Conference had explicitly

* The further fall of ten million pounds reported today in the note circulation brings the total decrease from the peak figure at Christmas to £45,200,000. In the corresponding four weeks of last year the note circulation fell by £21,000,000. . . . . With larger numbers of men now returning from the Forces the extent of the fall is somewhat surprising. We are now at a period when probably the biggest release groups are now coming back to industry. Evidently the smaller wage packets of the munition factories are more than offsetting the growing amount of gratuity money now going out to ex-Servicemen.

—(*Evening Standard, January* 24, 1946.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warned against such a turnover from cereals to the livestock basis immediately after the end of the war. The Communist Party alone of the political parties gave correct warning of the present crisis, and set out explicitly the agricultural policy which it is now universally recognised should have been followed. It is now essential to carry out urgent measures for the extension of the plough-up, to restore the wheat subsidy to £4 and possibly £5, and to establish the £4 10s. minimum for agricultural workers.

7. **Ending Waste of Foreign Exchange.** The Chancellor of the Exchequer said in the House of Commons on February 14:—

> Our gold and dollar reserves stand at £450 million. . . . We must conserve these gold and dollar reserves. It is important that these reserves shall not be rendered down at a dangerous rate.

Yet on the same day he announced that £25 million a month, representing a rate of £300 million a year, goes to the upkeep of the one and a half million armed forces overseas. The war in Java cost £4 million in a few months. The maintenance of General Anders' army in Italy costs £2 million a month or £24 million a year. At this rate the stock of gold and dollar reserves will soon be ended, and even the American loan, if obtained, will mainly go, not to assist British reconstruction, but to feed the voracious maw of Mr. Bevin's foreign policy. It is becoming a life and death question for Britain to end this senseless policy (which, be it noted, the Tories applaud, while making anti-Labour propaganda out of the consequent economic difficulties).

8. **International Economic Co-operation.** What is holding up an Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement and cramping down Anglo-Soviet trade to economic proportions? Is the Government Note to Czechoslovakia threatening trade restrictions in retaliation for its measures of nationalisation approved by the labour movement? The problems of Britain's foreign trade cannot be solved by the present anarchic scramble to take advantage of the present world shortage of goods and whoop up the consequent temporary expansion of sales of miscellaneous goods at high prices as a triumph. It is essential to link up the development of trade with a democratic policy of international co-operation, with close relations with the new European democratic Governments and reconstruction in Europe, with the Soviet Union, and with productive development in India under an Indian National Government and in the colonial countries.

9. **The Government and the Labour Movement.** The success of any economic plan and drive for increased production requires the closest co-operation between the Government and the labour movement. Mr. Bevin, in one of his gladiatorial speeches to the UNO Security Council, where he donned the mantle of the Anti-Comintern Pact in denouncing the Communist Parties of the world as the menace to peace, thought fit to sneer at the shop stewards as representing the opposition to his reactionary foreign policy. But the shop stewards are the key to the success of any production drive. It is of the utmost importance that the Conference should raise frankly the questions which are in the minds of the workers, including the distrust of the Government's anti-democratic foreign policy, which is one of the main factors causing the lack of response to the production drive. The Government will need to take the people much more into its confidence in regard to the lines and aims of its economic policy and the concrete character of its economic programme.

10. **Unity of the Labour Movement.** Finally, the success of the mass mobilisation of the organised labour movement to raise production and meet the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emergency of the present economic situation, which it is the object of the Conference to achieve, can only be won on the basis of the united strength of the entire movement and the ending of disruptive policies of sectional division. It does not make sense for the Government Ministers to appeal to the trade union executives, with the strong Communist contingent among them, for a united effort in support of the Government and the production drive, if at the same time in the political field they demand policies of division and denial of democratic rights to representatives in whom large bodies of trade unionists in the main industries and biggest unions have confidence. The establishment of unity through the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party is not only of vital importance for the political labour movement, but equally for the field of industry. The Labour Party Executive may still try in public to profess to discount the political weight of the Communist Party on the grounds of its present limited parliamentary representation. But the Labour Government Ministers concerned with the home economic front know very well the weight of the Communist Party when it comes to the question of winning the effective support of the workers in industry for the production drive and for the success of the schemes of nationalisation. In Norway it was the Trade Union Congress which took the lead in furthering negotiations between the Communist Party and the Labour Party for unity. The Conference of Trade Union Executives could perform a service in voicing to the political leaders the paramount need for working-class unity.

R. P. D.

February 18, 1946.

Publications Received

BOOKS

I Was One of the Unemployed by Max Cohen (Gollancz, 7*s*6*d*, 244 pp.).
The Governing of Men by Alexander H. Leighton (O.U.P., 25*s*, 404 pp.).
An African Survey (Second Edition) by Lord Hailey (O.U.P., 35*s*, 1,838 pp.).

PAMPHLETS

The Way Forward for Miners by Abe Moffat (Communist Party, 3*d*, 16 pp.).
What About Spain ? by Lon Elliott (International Brigade Association, 6*d*, 28 pp.).
Guilde to the Payment of Family Allowances. Foreword by Dr. Edith Summerskill (Hearts of Oak Benefit Society, 6*d*, 24 pp.).
Soviet Land and People by N. N. Mikhailov (*Soviet News*, 1*s*6*d*, 94 pp.).
The Electoral System of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (*Soviet News*, 6*d*, 24 pp.).
Science and the Progress of Man by James Wilson (Current Book Distributors, Sydney, 1*s*, 80 pp.).
Policy for Music in Postwar Britain (Workers Music Assoc., 1*s*, 24 pp.).
Soviet Local Government by Don Brown (Russia Today, 6*d*, 24 pp.).
Peace and the Atom by Professor Hyman Levy (Muse Arts Ltd., 1*s*6*d*, 32 pp.).
Who's Who in the Attlee Team by Maurice Goldsmith (Forward by Gordon Schaffer) (MuseArts Ltd., 1*s*6*d*, 32 pp.).

BOOKLETS, ETC.

The Modern Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1. December (Lawrence & Wishart, 2*s*6*d*, 96 pp.).
Industrial Relations in Conditions of Full Employment by H. S. Kirkaldy (C.U.P., 1*s*6*d*, 24 pp.).

PENGUINS

Psychology and World Order by Ranyard West (Pelican, 9*d*, 125 pp.).
Local Government in England and Wales by W. Eric Jackson (Pelican, 9*d*, 218 pp.).
An Atlas of the U.S.S.R. by J. F. Horrabin and James S. Gregory (1*s*, 64 pp.).

REPRODUCED 2005 BY MNZ ARCHIVE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Bevin and British Foreign Policy

by K. ZILLIACUS, M.P.

WHEREAS in home affairs the Labour Government are supported by a united and enthusiastic Party and are being bitterly fought by the Tories, in foreign affairs it is Tory roses, roses all the way for Mr. Bevin, while Labour back-benchers and the Party in the country are getting more and more puzzled and dismayed. It is important to understand just what is happening in our foreign policy, and why.

In 1938 Mr. Attlee wrote a book called *The Labour Party in Perspective* in which he said that the chief fault of the Labour Party in foreign policy after the first world war was that it had been content to borrow its ideas from the Liberals instead of hammering out a Socialist foreign policy of its own. He added that

"there is a deep difference of opinion between the Labour Party and the Capitalist parties on foreign as well as on home policy, because the two cannot be separated. The foreign policy of a Government is the reflection of its internal policy. Imperialism is the form which capitalism takes in relation to other nations. A Capitalist Government in Britain ... is nationalist, not internationalist in outlook. It may on particular occasions take action in foreign affairs with which the Labour Party agrees ... but such particular instances of action which can be approved by Socialists do not affect the truth of the general proposition that there is no agreement on foreign policy between a Labour Opposition and a Capitalist Government."

In spite of these brave words, the Labour Government after the second world war have thrown overboard the Labour Party's statements on foreign affairs and are continuing, in national unity with the Tories, the foreign policy they inherited from their Conservative predecessors in the Coalition. The result is that whereas the world is changing and our position in the world has changed, our foreign policy remains unchanged.

Anglo-Russian relations have generally been the acid test of British foreign policy. Let us take them as the starting-point of this analysis. To give the necessary perspective, let us begin with the Russian Revolution.

"Hate of the revolution and fear of its consequences in England were the dominant reactions of Conservatives. . . . I found the same fears among the Labour patriots," wrote Bruce Lockhart in *Memoirs of a British Agent*. "The Allies greeted the revolution first with feigned enthusiasm and then with increasing alarm. They wanted—and on the part of the military advisers the wish was natural—things to be put back where they were before."

The Tories are still in the state of mind that these quotations reveal. Between the wars they lost the peace because they first fought the Social revolution in Russia and Europe, then boycotted the Soviet Union, and finally appeased the fascist aggressors. They view the second wave of the social revolution, released by the second world war in Europe and the Far East (where the French and Russian Revolutions have arrived hand in hand) with the same hysterical hatred and dread that they fought the first wave in 1918-21. The ex-appeasers of yesterday still sitting on the Tory benches have turned into the frustrated interventionists of today. Their view of what ought to be done now is still that of Lord D'Abernon in his book, *An Ambassador of Peace*, when he wrote, defending the Locarno Treaties (The Western bloc of those days):—

It was apparent to those who took a world view that Western civilisation was menaced by an external danger which, coming into being during the war,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threatened a cataclysm equalled only by the fall of the Roman Empire. This danger arose from the sweeping success in 1917 of the revolution against the Czarist regime and the establishment in Russia of a fanatical Communist Government, animated by hatred of all political organisations which stood in the way of a world victory of the Soviet creed. . . .

Resistance to communistic propaganda, the maintenance of peace in Europe, the avoidance of another Great War, the establishment of security for respective frontiers, the preservation of society on existing lines, were capital objects of British policy. But there was more than this. England's stupendous and vital interests in Asia were menaced by a danger graver than any which existed in the time of the old Imperialistic regime in Russia. Hostility to England or jealousy of the intrusion of British civilisation into Asia were indeed of old standing. For the last seventy years of the nineteenth century, rivalry between England and Russia had been a dominant fact in history. But the Bolsheviks disposed of two weapons which Imperial Russia lacked—class-revolt propaganda, appealing to the proletariat of the world, and the quasi-religious fanaticism of Lenin, which infused a vigour and zeal unknown to the officials and emissaries of the Czar.

"Resistance to communistic propaganda," "the preservation of society on existing lines," and the determination to defend Britain's "stupendous and vital" interests in Asia by excluding the U.S.S.R. from the Middle East, are the operative parts of this statement. They were the "capital objects" pursued above all others by British foreign policy between the wars. That is why our foreign policy played a big part in bringing about the second world war.

The Tories are so enthusiastic about Mr. Bevin's foreign policy, because they see it apparently pursuing the same traditional aims and animated by the same 19th century motives as those so ably summarised by Lord D'Abernon twenty years ago. Mr. Bevin's speeches in the House and in the Security Council pour balm on the suffering souls of the frustrated interventionists on the Tory benches.

Mr. Bevin's outburst on February 1 in the Security Council against the Communist Parties of the world aroused the utmost enthusiasm in the press of Franco Spain and Fascist Argentine, not to mention the Greek Royalists, General Anders' Polish Army in Italy, the Hearst press and the *Chicago Tribune* in the U.S.A., the Kemsley and Rothermere papers here and the whole rag-tail and bobtail of the fascist and reactionary down and outers throughout Europe. For they all dream of another war of intervention that will put them back where they were before. And did not Mr. Bevin say that "It has been the incessant propaganda of Moscow and the incessant propaganda of the Communist Party in every country in the world to attack the British people and the British Government as if there has been no friendship between us. That is the danger to the peace of the world. It sets us against one another, causes suspicion and misunderstanding, and makes one wonder what the motive is ?"

On the same occasion Mr. Bevin admitted that British troops had gone into Greece, not to liberate the country from the Germans, but in order to prevent the resistance movement, E.A.M. (then a broadly-based coalition including nearly all democratic elements) from taking charge of the country. Instead, we put into power a pack of reactionaries, Royalists and ex-collaborators, who instituted a reign of terror against the Left.

In December, 1944, Mr. Bevin told the Labour Conference that Greece had been invaded because "The British Empire cannot abandon its position in the Mediterranean." That is a return to the Imperial strategy of the last century, which was directed to keeping Russia out of the Balkans and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Middle East and bottled up in the Black Sea. The same strategic conception appeared in Mr. Bevin's remark when, speaking to the House on November 7 about the Soviet desire to be made trustee of an Italian colony, he said, "One cannot help being a little suspicious if a great Power wants to come right across, shall I say, the throat of the British Commonwealth. . . . One is driven to ask oneself the motive."

Again, when on November 21, Brigadier Maclean asked for an assurance that "it is the intention of H.M. Government in all circumstances to safeguard our imperial interests in South Persia and the Persian Gulf," Mr. Bevin answered grandly that "It is the intention of His Majesty's Government to safeguard British interests in whatever part of the world they may be found."

The Brigadier then asked how the Government proposed "to carry out this assurance in this particular case." Mr. Bevin replied: "I cannot divulge to the hon. and gallant member, in answer to a question, all the strategy of the Chiefs of Staffs and everybody else concerned."

Even the Brigadier felt bound to protest the next day that "That was not at all the answer that I expected or desired. Strategy and Chiefs of Staff are brought into play, not in keeping order in our outlying part of Asia, but in a major war, and that is exactly what we are out to avoid."

Mr. Bevin's outlook on Europe, the Middle East and the Soviet Union, it will be observed, does not differ by a hair's breadth from that of Lord D'Abernon twenty years ago, in the days when we lost the last peace. Our Foreign Secretary stands with one foot in the Crimean Conference and the other in the Crimean War.

The truth is that the War Office, the Admiralty and the Foreign Office are running our foreign policy, not the Labour Government. And in Europe, the Middle East, the Far East (Indonesia) alike, they are pursuing the traditional social and Imperial aims of the old governing class, who may have lost the election, but are still overwhelmingly represented in the Foreign and Colonial Offices and the fighting services.

But the world has changed, and our position in the world, including the things for which the British people are prepared to fight, have changed.

The Soviet Union has emerged from the second world war as a first-class world power, and bids fair in ten or fifteen years to be the greatest world power. There is a tremendous ferment and stir among the peoples of the East, where the demand for national independence and political democracy, and the desire for social change, are working together powerfully in men's minds.

The Communists of today are not the Communists of 1919. They are incomparably more mature and powerful. They are the leaders of most or all of the working-class in nearly every country in Europe except the old democracies of the North-West fringe, Switzerland and Austria. They represent the mighty Soviet Union and nearly all the forces of democracy and progress in that vast country, China, where they rule over whole provinces. They lead most of the organised workers in Latin America. They played a heroic and central part in the underground resistance movements, and have emerged in leading positions in the progressive coalitions that alone are capable of reconstructing the war-shattered countries where democracy has been destroyed or never existed, and where the old social order has broken down beyond repair. They are working hand in hand with the Socialist parties in most countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This country, at the present rate of demobilisation, will still have over 2,000,000 men under arms next June—a higher figure than the United States. We cannot afford to maintain much more than a quarter of that figure for any length of time. Let the fate of France serve as a warning. General de Gaulle's policy of prestige and megalomania brought that country to the verge of economic collapse, and has necessitated drastic cuts in France's military establishment and armaments.

If we are not to wreck our economic reconstruction we must cut our commitments, armaments and military establishments ruthlessly. We are not physically able to fight the Soviet Union and the British people would make short work of any Government insane enough to go to war about oil or strategic or any other of the "vital interests" in the Middle East so dear to the Foreign Office and the War Office and Admiralty, but about which British workers know nothing and care less.

Mr. Attlee said on January 29 that our vast military commitments were necessary to world peace. Let the United Nations Security Council be the judge of that. Offer to share with our fellow-members of the Security Council all our commitments to maintain peace, including such matters as Indonesia; Greece; Palestine; control of oil resources and irrigation and development schemes in the Middle East; control of the inlets and outlets of the Mediterranean and Black Sea; and the demilitarisation of the Straits (Dardanelles) the Dodecanese and Cyprus.

In the conditions of power-politics and international anarchy, it is the pleasant habit of War Offices, Admiralties and Air Ministries (under some such body as the Imperial Defence Committee) to prepare plans ceaselessly for war against States with whom we might be at war. Our fighting services no longer go through that routine against the United States. War between the English-speaking nations is regarded as unthinkable and is left out of our defence calculations. That is also true of France.

The Labour Government should instruct the Imperial Defence Committee and the fighting services to cease preparing plans for possible war between any or all of the permanent Security Council members, since they cannot under the Charter declare each other aggressors and are jointly charged with the maintenance of world peace. That means no more preparations for war or disposal of forces according to strategic calculations, against the Soviet Union. That would enable us to bring most of our soldiers home from the Near and Middle East in double-quick time.

Nearer home, we should apply Labour's declared policy of co-operating with the governing coalitions that have issued from the resistance movements, in order to unite, reconstruct and pacify Europe through a sweeping advance to Socialism and on the basis of the Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet Alliances.

On those lines we could make peace. On present lines we are drifting to disaster.

It will be noticed that we have changed the cover of the magazine and hope that you will appreciate its effectiveness and neatness.

PRODUCED 2009 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unity Then and Now

by JOHN HORNER

A FEW months ago the B.B.C. broadcast a record of excerpts from "War Commentary." We heard once again the First Airborne Division descending on Arnheim. The commentator was saying "These are the boys who will make possible the crossing of the Rhine, there they go—they're going down now, don't ever forget them." Next day a friend of mine said to me that that broadcast should be put over every six months. For in the midst of the worries and shortages of 1946 we need to remember those days. In the factories, in the mines, in Civil Defence with the flying bombs, and in the forces over on the other side we all worked together for an inspiring purpose. Our imagination was seized, our enthusiasm commanded. Months later millions of people who, for four or five years, had been quietly turning over in their minds the reasons for the suffering into which the world had been plunged, went to the polls and voted for a new way of running things. Rallying those millions, carrying through an immense propaganda and educational campaign were the Labour and the Communist Parties. Labour Party member and Communist worked together over the greater part of the country, and it was no fault of the Communists that this unity did not exist in every constituency. Together we had won the war, we were out to win the peace.

Peace had been something to dream about. The lights would go up, there would be more clothing coupons, some hope of an end to the dreary round of queues and rationing. Away in Burma, on the Continent, our lads looked forward to home. The cold douche of recent events has awakened any who may have remained in dreamland. The loss of dried eggs with all that it means for hard-pressed, tired and underfed housewives must appear insignificant against the fact that before this coming summer is over eighty million people throughout the world will be in the throes of famine—which at this stage we can do little to avert. Congress debates the loan. Industries upon which Britain's future prosperity must be founded, coal, textiles, agriculture, cry out for men. The job before our Labour Government is bigger and more complex than any which has faced a previous Government. In *Let Us Face the Future* and *How to Win the Peace* the Labour and Communist Parties stated their common programme. Well, this is the future about which we spoke, this is the peace!

Hard facts will be borne in upon our people in the next few months. To convert to peace production Britain's industries, geared up for years in a common war effort with the Allies; even partially to overcome in these industries generations of capitalist neglect and greed; to sweep away the "hang-over" of the attitude of mind in millions of workers to their jobs, the result of this neglect and greed, and to replace it by an enthusiasm and hope leading to a new outlook on production, these are but some of the tasks before our Government. And they are indeed immense. They will need all the drive and initiative which can be mustered from the politically thinking working-class. Let us face it. There is no such widespread enthusiasm today. The recent by-elections show that after eight months our Government maintains the sober loyalty of the majority of the people. But go into any pit, factory or queue and one quickly realises that to carry through Labour's programme we need something more than four hundred members in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House of Commons. It does me good every time I go to the House. There are scores of gifted, brilliant young Labour members. There has never been such a talented Parliament. But in its endeavours to defeat the rising power of the workers, capitalism will rely not merely upon its "third eleven" on the Opposition benches. We cannot leave the job to our members. The Tories will be unscrupulous. To what depths they are prepared to sink can partially be gauged by the despicable manner in which they have attempted to exploit the housewives' natural resentment against the loss of dried eggs.

Whether or not our Government's first five years can pave the way for the further advance to a Socialist Britain will depend very directly on the strength and understanding support of the labour movement as a whole. The affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party is not, then, something which has now appeared on the annual Conference agenda as a result of the "three years' clause" in the Labour Party's Standing Orders. On the contrary, it is a vitally urgent matter, an issue affecting Britain's present and future. The affiliation of the Communist Party arises from the present needs of the British people.

The British people are playing for high stakes. A stronger Labour Government at the next election, capitalism much weakened, and our movement in a more favourable position to advance towards Socialism—these will result from the present Government's successes. Failure would bring disillusionment, would strengthen reaction, cause widespread disunity in our ranks and might pave the way for the rise of fascism in new forms. And to achieve this success the trade unions have a special responsibility. In the trade union movement restrictions against Communist Party members are now almost entirely removed. Now, trade unions are stronger than ever. Communists hold leading positions in many of the major unions. They are to be found among the driving forces of the miners, engineers and transport workers. A communist sits on the General Council of the Trades Union Congress. The British trade union movement has fostered the birth of the World Federation of Trade Unions, where Communists and non-communists together are building one of the most potent factors in reshaping the world. On March 6 Cabinet Ministers representing the Government will meet the assembled trade union executives to seek their co-operation in solving this country's immediate industrial problems. At that conference there will be many a communist member of the Executives.

And yet we are faced with a paradox. Our Labour Government will more and more come to rely upon our trade unions, and still communists in those unions are excluded from fully participating in the political wing of their movement. I hope I will be forgiven if I take an example with which I am best acquainted. In the General Election my union financially supported seven Labour candidates. It devoted a large proportion of its political fund to the National Election Fund of the Labour Party. It released organisers and officials for campaigning work in the constituencies. It relieved its general secretary in order that he might tour the country to speak for Labour candidates. Without immodesty, I can say that the prestige of the firemen, particularly in Southern England, was such that they exercised some influence in swaying the electorate in various blitzed towns. With members of his executive, the general secretary represented the union at conferences at Transport House at which the Labour Party's financial election arrangements were discussed. But this same union is prohibited

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from sending this general secretary to the annual Labour Party Conference as one of its delegates, since he is a member of the Communist Party.

The weakness of which this is an example in the trade unions can be duplicated a hundredfold in the divisional Labour Parties. The continued ban and prohibitions against communists stultify much good work which would otherwise be done throughout the length and breadth of the land. The affiliation of the Communist Party would draw and hold together men and women, the best political workers, the core of our movement, in the towns and counties, men and women from whom this Government must continue to draw its strength.

Meanwhile disunity, proscriptions against the Communist Party weakens and frustrates the work of these same men and women.

In Europe, where the communists of France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Yugoslavia, Poland, Italy, are working desperately alongside Socialists to rebuild their devasted countries, unity of the British labour movement would be an immense encouragement. Incidentally, it would remove many of the misgivings which have arisen there as a result of certain recent features of Britain's foreign policy. It would expose the baselessness of the sinister argument canvassed in some quarters here, and not unnoticed in Europe, that the disharmony between this country and the Soviet Union in foreign affairs arises from the "ideological conflict of Communism v. Social Democracy."

Why, then, does the Labour Party Executive refuse affiliation? The last time this issue was featured on a Labour Party Annual Conference Agenda it was, argued the Executive Committee, because of the existence of the Communist International and the non-existence of an annual balance sheet of the British Communist Party! I wish to enter into no polemics here, but Mr. Morgan Phillips has stated that because the Communist Party is "ineffective" and "politically incapable" its application cannot be considered. The Communist Party has the proudest record of any section of Britain's labour movement. Excluded from equal rights with other sections, under heavy disabilities, it has a long story of achievement. In the period before and during the general strike, twenty years ago, leading the unemployed, fighting against Mosley, aiding democratic Spain and building the International Brigade, strengthening Anglo-Soviet friendship, exposing the Chamberlain Government and the Men of Munich. Above all, the Communist Party's positive contributions to the winning of the war with its examples of increased production and the organisation of joint production committees, with its sustained campaign for the Second Front, now completely justified by the publication of Eisenhower's Diary, are but some indications of the Communist Party's effectiveness and political capability. Most recently the organised and consistent propaganda and literature sales which for years preceded the General Election, even when the Labour Party's activity in the localities was at its lowest ebb, coupled with the sweeping enthusiasm of communists in the election work itself, alone demonstrate the virility of this party which has been an example to our movement for a generation.

I would seek to avoid a battle of quotations, but I cannot refrain from quoting Mr. Herbert Morrison when, in a recent speech on Labour Party discipline, he said "When men feel deeply and agree sincerely about their objective, they instinctively move together in the same direction." The communists feel at least as deeply and agree as sincerely as do their Labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party friends about their common objective of a Socialist Britain. Together they will move more quickly, with less hesitation and with greater confidence towards that objective if the restrictions hobbling both the Communist Party and the Labour Party were removed.

The only argument which remains in the armoury of the opponents of affiliation is that this unity could be achieved by the dissolution of the Communist Party. The movement could only be weakened by such a dissolution. Communists are examples to the working-class movement because they *are* communists, members of a party which by its deep political understanding, its organisation and leadership, is able to strengthen and maintain its individual members in their personal efforts towards the common objective. The British working-class movement would lose much that is of inestimable value by the dissolution of the Communist Party. By the unity of the two parties the gain would be equally incalculable.

The world has moved on since 1943, when this item was last on the Labour Party agenda. Our own Tunisian victory, and the emergence of new Red Armies from Stalingrad were the first beacons of hope in those grim days. Now, the fascists whom we fought then, stand in the dock at Nuremberg. In this new atomic world, events may well move with equal speed. In the face of great obstacles, but inspired by the hope of our people, our movement must call upon all the experience and self-sacrifice that can be summoned to aid our Government. We of the Communist Party have much to contribute. We shall help, but together with the Labour Party we can use the coming years not to make a decaying social system work a little more efficiently, last a little longer, but to lay the basis for a happy, prosperous Britain. It was for this that the men at Arnheim fought and died. In the light of what they did, the bitterness and controversy which has riven our movement for so long, must now become a thing of the past. It is time to move forward together.

A Square Deal for Women

by BERT PAPWORTH*

AFTER the world war of 1914-8, after all the compliments to the wives and mothers and sisters and daughters who had played such an essential part in the winning of victory, the women were kicked out of industry.

Is it to be the same after this war?

This question is vital, not only for the women themselves, but also for the trade unions of this country. A trade union principle is at stake. And if a narrow and short-sighed outlook on this matter is found amongst certain sections of the trade unions, it only shows that there has been a failure to realise the broader trade union principle that is involved.

During the past century women have made considerable advance along the path of political emancipation. But in this country we are still a long way from complete social and economic equality of men and women. This lack of equality is especially manifest in the field of industry.

The 1914-18 war proved their adaptability and their capability. The intervening period between the two

* Bert Papworth is a member of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and of the Executive Committee of the Transport and General Workers Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great World Wars saw women establishing themselves in every walk of life. Sheer ability, competence, and confidence forced recognition of them. Some women are failures, yet so are some men. So what!

I do not argue that women won the war, but I do argue that the war could not have been won without the aid of women of the Allied Nations, and I claim that the women of Great Britain made a terrific contribution to the winning of the war against fascism, as great or equal to that of the man.

Nor am I arguing the claim of women being better than men, any more than men being better than women. I simply argue equality. I argue the right of a woman to a career to a job on equal terms with man. I do not argue favours for the women, I argue that the two sexes stand or fall together on the agreed conditions of the set-up into which they venture.

I believe in the rights of a married woman to be equal to the rights of a married man or single girl or fellow. A man is not penalised because he remains single. It is never argued that he should not be given a job, because a married man is out of work.

Ability and adaptability is surely the basis of employing a person. The rate for the job is surely the correct method of payment; equality of conditions must go with it.

I do not want to sentimentalise, but let us face facts. Women have done every job, including fighting, that men have done during this war. In this country women were conscripted, women were called up for the A.T.S., the W.A.A.Fs. and the W.R.E.N.S.

It is not a question that this person or that class of person has a prior right to a job; everybody has a right to a job of their choice, compatible with efficient organised production and distribution, compatible with Social Service.

Now, it is not a question of women putting ex-soldiers out of work, which is a favourite argument of the anti-women band (they forget there are ex-service women) and in any case it is purely sentimental nonsense. I was taught at school "He that does not work, neither shall he eat" and that the "He" went for the "She" also.

It is wrong to set the interests of the ex-servicemen against the interests of other workers, male or female.

The question is more than the right of women to work in industry. Indeed, if women don't come into industry in very large and increasing numbers, this old country of ours is going to be a back number; and women will only come into industry if they get a square deal. It is no good trade unions passing pious resolutions about equality, agreeing to dilution, negotiating the rate for the job, if those things are to be used only in favour of the man and to be used against women at man's whim.

Man must remember equality is his real protection of a good wage. If you take women into a trade union, you have a duty to fight with them as well as to expect them to fight with you. It must be united struggle—a struggle of the masses for the masses, and women are of the masses.

Trade unions must look to it that "women's rates" are abolished. Instead, there must be a trade union rate for the job, for every job. Who talks of women's work? It is the industrialist for the purpose of getting cheap labour. Why is laundry work, canteen work, domestic employment, looked upon as women's work? Why are women being discharged from established rate-for-the-job situations, and being offered nursing, Land Army, laundry or canteen work? Is there any job more physically tiring than these? They are "women's rate" jobs, harder than many jobs recognised as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men's jobs. Why not, then, pay a rate where men or women shall be free to take the jobs upon the basis of capacity to earn?

I take the illustration of mining. The reason miners are leaving the pits is because they are not paid a wage compatible with the filthy and dangerous job they have to do. Pay good wages and you will get the coal. Pay good wages and you will get laundry, canteen and land workers, not necessarily women.

We must prevent workers being compelled to work in bad conditions and for low wages.

Another illustration from another angle. Fifteen women conductors were discharged from London Passenger Transport Board Country Services, Windsor Garage. All these women were offered canteen work, laundry work, nursing or land work. The Board, through the Public Relations Officer, has made a statement that policy has been determined, and that all women conductors working for L.P.T.B. will go shortly. Yet those who have requested to leave have been asked to stay a month or so longer—"don't want you, but we'll use you, stop gaps" . . . see what I mean?

Glasgow Labour Corporation are getting rid of their women. Barrow Labour Transport Committee sacked approximately 200 workers for striking, took on sixty to seventy *strike-breakers*. These 200 have been reinstated, while the strike-breakers are to be kept on as well. Who is going to get the sack? Women, of course. Women are being sacked who have become skilled and used to the work and men who have never been in these industries taken on. Surely the sound economic policy is to encourage men to go into trades where there is a shortage of labour at the moment, and likely to be in the future. Good wages and conditions are the things to recruit workers.

This country is crying out for export trade, it is crying out for more goods, for home consumption. Yet according to the Government we are short by 1,000,000 in man-power. A conference of trade union executives has been agreed to by the Trades Union Congress to be addressed by members of the Government on the urgent question of man-power. Thousands more German prisoners are to be brought here to work because of the shortage. Yet a great labour force exists in our very midst, women and girls, many highly skilled arising from their "war-directed" job. Their skill does not matter: it is a man's job now. No heed is paid to the fact that the girls have, by this direction, lost five to six years for any career they wished.

What nonsense that is! There are plenty of jobs for men and women and will be and should always be in a properly balanced society working for the improved standard of life of the worker. There should always be more jobs than workers to fill them. Only by that method can the standard of living rise.

Why, then, should women be treated as stop-gaps? Why not a square deal, a square deal from the politicians, from the trade unions, from their fellow-workers, and from industrialists?

Stop this nonsense of forcing women out of industry where they are upon a basis of equality in order to get them, under economic pressure, to do the lousy jobs in lousy conditions at lousy "women's rates." This is 1946. Women have done a good job in war. They have a great future in peace. That many women will have to work, some having been widowed (perhaps by war) is certain and that many more will go to it, some by choice, others by encouragement, is equally certain. See, then, that they get and give a square deal.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Investment Bill

by J. WINTER

WHEN the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Dalton, moved the second reading of the Investment (Control and Guarantees) Bill on February 5, he called it "a simple, short, modest, but necessary measure." *Modesty* is, indeed, the main feature of this Bill, which does not extend in any way the existing investment control, which was introduced during the war, but only prolongs it without a time limit.

The Bill consists of two clauses. Clause I gives power to the Treasury to control all new capital issues exceeding £50,000 in twelve months. This control will be exercised, as it was till now, through the Capital Issues Committee, a body of bankers and business men under Lord Kennet as chairman. Two retiring members were replaced by three new appointments. One of them is Mr. H. V. Berry, who has "the unusual qualification of being equally well-known and respected in the City of London and in the Fabian Society," as Mr. Dalton said. He would not claim, however, that this modest injection of Fabian blood was meant to change essentially the character of a body which has a strictly negative function: to prevent merely speculative or fraudulent investments or such business ventures which are not desirable from the point of view of reserving all economic resources for the essential purposes of reconstruction.

A much more ambitious task is set to the "National Investment Council," a new institution set up by this Bill. In the words of the Government Memorandum (Cmd. 6726) explaining the purpose of the Investment Bill: "This Council will assist the Government in so organising and, when necessary, stimulating investment as to promote full employment." The Chancellor of the Exchequer himself will be the chairman, among the other members are: the Governor of the Bank of England (Lord Catto) the chairman of the Stock Exchange, Sir Clive Baillieu, president of the Federation of British Industries, a vice-chairman of the Midland Bank and—to counterbalance this representative selection of "hardfaced businessmen"—a prominent trade union leader and Mr. C. E. Prater of the Co-operative Wholesale Society. This body will have only an advisory capacity.

Clause II of the Bill empowers the Treasury to guarantee loans up to £50 millions in any one year for the purpose of facilitating industrial reconstruction in Great Britain.

While the Tory opposition in the House performed their usual demagogic shadow-boxing, claiming that the initiative and inventiveness of the "small man," the newcomer in industrial enterprise, would be hamstrung by Treasury "dictatorship" and bureaucratic controls, a considerable amount of well-founded criticism came from the Labour backbenchers. Mr. Ellis Smith, who recently resigned from his position on the Board of Trade, Mr. Stanley Evans, Mr. Mayhew, author of a well-informed Fabian pamphlet on "Planned Investment," Capt. R. Adams, Mr. Mallalieu and others openly confessed their disappointment.

Even if it is understood that this Bill has to be taken in connection with other measures as the nationalisation of the Bank of England and only as one link in the chain of controls by which the Labour Government wants to adapt Britain's economy to the urgent needs of reconstruction, the Bill falls short of what is suggested by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"investment control" and what could be expected after Labour's election promises.

By this Bill the Government does not get any control over the most essential part of investments, the reinvestment of reserves and profits of existing private companies. Of £715,000,000 investments in 1938 only £76 millions were new issues by private enterprise, hardly more than 15 per cent. Mr. Dalton answered this criticism by pointing out that the rest of investments could be controlled by the so-called physical controls, allocation of raw materials, etc. But this argument is rather unconvincing. Either these physical controls, operated by the Board of Trade, are sufficient to direct investments, then there is no case for a complicated machinery to control new investments; or they are not, then the Bill will fail to achieve what it promises.

In fact, the Government has not the power to direct investments into those channels where the public interest would demand them to be directed. Through Working Parties private enterprise can be *advised* how to reorganise, modernise or expand their plant. But capitalists alone decide what to do with their profits and reserves. Undesirable new capital issues can be prevented by Clause I of the Bill, but there is general agreement among experts that a guarantee up to £50 millions would not be enough to stimulate investments when a slump is beginning to develop. In 1929 monthly capital issues dropped from £47.4 millions in January to 3.6 in August and 2.7 in September. The guaranteed sum, provided for a year, would just cover the gap for one month!

As things stand now, the Labour Government appears to have neither an investment plan nor machinery to devise a plan. Mr. Dalton tried to explain why the idea of a National Investment Board, proposed in Labour's programme as an executive organ for a policy of planned investment, had not been taken up in the Bill. He said, the Government itself must take the responsibility for planning, including the planning of investment.

That the Government is responsible for every aspect of Government policy, is a truism. But this does not make the Government an expert body capable of undertaking the great work of economic planning in detail. In the only country where a planned economy exists, the Government only outlines the general aims and principles of the plan. A special institution, Gosplan, works out the details and the whole working population is taken into confidence and helps in implementing it.

But the labour movement at the present time does not know where the Government stands with planning for full employment. Do they stand by the White Paper on Employment Policy of the coalition Government which was introduced by Mr. Bevin in 1944? Or do they accept the more far-reaching proposals of Sir W. Beveridge, who quite correctly pointed out that the idea of the White Paper to "iron out" booms and slumps by public works would not work?

There is some official talk about a "man-power budget," one of the main planks of Beveridge's Full Employment policy. But at the moment ministers are only concerned with getting the man-power necessary for reconstruction, not with making plans to guarantee jobs for all in the future.

Mr. Ellis Smith, who as Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Board of Trade up to a few weeks ago, should be in the know, indicated that no preliminary economic plans have been drawn up by the Government. His demand for a national economic plan, based on a maximum amount of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national ownership, and for an "economic general staff" should be endorsed by the labour movement as a whole. Representatives of the trade unions and the co-operative societies should hold the key positions on the planning staff instead of serving as a kind of camouflage on the National Investment Council which looks more like a control committee of Big Business over Government policy than the other way round.

The question who will control the development of the productive resources of our country cannot be decided by measures like this Investment Bill. A far more effective policy will be necessary, backed by the united and determined efforts of the working-class.

India and Pakistan

by R. PALME DUTT

THE announcement of the Cabinet Mission to India has thrown into the forefront of world attention the critical issues which are now coming up for decision in India.

The present elections are only the curtain-raiser to the coming struggle for Indian freedom. In accordance with the plan inherited by the Labour Government from its coalition predecessor, and rejected by all Indian political organisations, the Viceroy, in association with the Cabinet Mission, after the completion of the elections in April, will enter into negotiations with the Indian political parties with a view to including their representatives in a new Executive Council and setting up the proposed "constitution-making body" to draw up a new constitution for India.

If these steps do not result in a settlement, a very sharp issue will arise between the British Government and the overwhelming Indian national demand for independence. This political conflict will coincide with the grave and growing economic disorganisation, reflecting years of war maladministration and the bankruptcy of the old governmental machinery, and the prospects of impending famine on a scale even more terrible than in 1943. The stormy conflicts in Calcutta and elsewhere, with government use of troops and firing, and the demonstrations for national freedom among the Indian armed forces, are a signal of the rising tension.

Democratic opinion in Britain and throughout the world has very great responsibility in relation to the new developments in India. The British parliamentary delegation to India may not have been successful in convincing the Indian people of their "good will," so long as the present policy is maintained. But they will certainly have learned something of the strength and depth of the determination of the Indian people to throw off their bondage and take their place among the free peoples of the world.

* * *

The results of the elections cannot afford more than a partial guide to Indian public opinion. The overwhelming majority of the people are disfranchised. The electoral system does not extend to the Indian States under the Princes, covering a quarter of the population. Further, the limited electorate is divided into a complex array of religious and economic compartments guaranteed to produce the most unfavourable picture of permanent irreconcilable division as the distorted mirror of the Indian people.

The electorate for the Central Legislative Assembly is less than one-half of one per cent. of the population of British India. The electorate for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Provincial Assemblies is 11 per cent. (contrasting with 67 per cent. of the population enfranchised in Britain).

Thus the Indian electoral system is far removed from the free democratic elections by universal suffrage which the British Government so peremptorily demands for countries not under British rule. The demand for free democratic elections in India to elect a Constituent Assembly by adult suffrage which would enable the Indian people freely to choose their own future form of government has so far been refused by the Labour Government. The Labour Government still clings to the Churchill-Amery-Cripps plan of 1942, which has been rejected by all sections of Indian opinion.

* * *

Nevertheless, within these limits, the election results so far available (the main provincial election results are still to come) throw some light on current political trends in India. They reveal a considerable eclipse of minor sectional groupings, and the general tendency of the electorate to concentrate around the two main political organisations which stand for the aim of independence: the National Congress, the principal organisation of the national movement, with an overwhelming majority in all general seats, and an over-all majority for the country as a whole; and the Moslem League, with a decisive majority in the special Moslem seats.

In the Central Legislative Assembly elections the Congress won 56 seats (previously 36) with 91 per cent. of the votes in all general seats, and 59.6 per cent. of the total vote. The Moslem League won all the 30 Moslem seats (previously 25) with 86 per cent. of the Moslem vote and 27.6 per cent. of the total vote.

The Provincial election results are only beginning to come in at the time of writing. The initial results show a more varied picture, with some cases of Congress Moslem candidates winning Moslem seats against the Moslem League; so that in Sind, a Moslem-majority province, the Congress and its supporters are likely to hold the majority position. But the general indications point to a similar division of forces for the results as a whole, with the Congress as the decisive leading party, and the Moslem League dominating Moslem seats.

These results, apart from their partial value as an indication of popular feeling, have an additional importance, since the Government's "constitution-making body" is expected to be in part based on the representation achieved in these elections.

Both the Congress and the Moslem League proclaim the aim of Indian independence. But the Congress stands for a united India with a high degree of autonomy for the constituent parts. The Moslem League demands the partition of India into two sovereign States, Pakistan (based on the provinces with a Moslem majority) and Hindustan; and insists that this must first be agreed by the Congress or granted by British imperialism before independence is conceded or any future constitutional arrangements considered.

Here is a controversy which, failing agreement between the Congress and the League, can play into the hands of British imperialism to proclaim the irreconcilable divisions of Indian political opinion and on this basis proceed to impose its own constitution as the only solution.

Hence it is essential that democratic opinion in Britain should be forewarned and forearmed on these issues, and not allow these divisions to be made the alibi for refusing independence to India.

* * *

The growth of the Moslem League to a wide mass following among Indian Moslems is a recent develop-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of the past decade. In the 1937 elections the Moslem League was only able to obtain 4.6 per cent. of the total Moslem votes (total Moslem votes, 7,319,445; Moslem League votes, 321,772). When the Moslem League was originally founded in 1906 with British official encouragement, it was founded as a separatist communal organisation, distinct from the non-communal National Congress, alongside the establishment of communal electorates, with the hope of British official quarters that it would serve to disrupt the national movement and weaken the rising strength of the Congress. In the words of a British official reporting to the Viceroy, Lord Minto, at the time:—

> I must send your Excellency a line to say that a very, very big thing has happened today. A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people (Moslems) from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition (Congress).*

Lady Minto adds that very much the same view was taken at Whitehall. During the first three decades the Moslem League remained a narrow communal organisation, appealing mainly to the upper-class Moslem landowners, with the exception of the period of the Khilafat agitation in the years following the last war, when it joined forces temporarily with the Congress. The 1937 elections revealed its weakness. Its membership figures were never published.

What causes have led to its growth to a mass following in the recent period? Several factors may be distinguished.

First, the political ferment of the past decade has drawn new masses, including previously backward sections, into the first forms of political consciousness. Both the Congress and the Moslem League have grown in strength. Wide numbers of these newly-awakened sections among the Moslems have turned to the Moslem League as their political organisation. They have not been attracted by the undeniably strong Hindu religious flavour of much Congress propaganda, especially of the right wing leadership and Gandhi, despite the public non-communal platform of the Congress and the presence of outstanding patriotic Moslems in its ranks.

Second, there have been tactical mistakes of the Congress leadership in its dealings with the Moslem League during the period of the Congress Provincial Ministries and subsequently. The degree of confusion, conflicting trends and vacillation of the mass political leadership of the Congress in the complex situation during the war and immediately preceding it (election of Bose as President and expulsion of Bose; passivity during the imperialist phase of the war; policy of neither helping nor opposing the war effort; individual satyagraha; the ill-starred August resolution at the moment of the Japanese advance, followed by arrest of the leadership, difficult conditions of illegality, and sporadic disorders, disclaimed at the time by the leadership and subsequently acclaimed as a national struggle) and neglect of social mass leadership in the war conditions of economic difficulty and famine, led to a measure of political disorganisation and demoralisation during the later stages of the war, weakening the appeal of a united national movement during this period.

Third, within the Moslem League there developed a younger radical section pressing a democratic programme against the resistance of the older reactionary leadership on top, and in certain districts and provinces, as in the Punjab and Bengal, conducting an active fight on social and economic

* Lady Minto, *India, Minto and Morley*, 1934, p. 47.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass issues winning mass support among the poorer Moslems.

Fourth, the wider mass extension of the national movement brought to the surface new forms of national consciousness reflecting the varied national elements of the Indian people; and in the case of those national elements, especially in North-Western India, whose religious faith was Moslem, the slogan of Pakistan reflected, albeit in a distorted form, and gathered up this newly developing national consciousness. This clearer emergence of the multi-national character of the Indian people, with the advance of the national movement, had been foreseen by Stalin when he wrote in 1912:—

> In the case of India, too, it will probably be found that innumerable nationalities, till then lying dormant, would come to life with the further course of bourgeois development.

* * *

What, then, is the programme of Pakistan, and what should be our judgment of it?

The demand for Pakistan was first adopted by the Moslem League in 1940. Previously, when the proposal had been originally put forward by a few individuals during the thirties (the poet Iqbal in 1930 and some students at Cambridge in 1933) the political leaders of the Moslem League, in their evidence to the Joint Committee on Constitutional Reform in 1933, had rejected it as "a student's dream" and "chimerical and impracticable." As late as 1937 the anual congress of the Moslem League proclaimed the aim of "the establishment in India of full independence in the form of a Federation of free democratic States." But the Lahore Congress of the Moslem League in 1940 adopted the resolution:—

> Resolved that it is the considered view of this session of the All-India Moslem League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Moslems unless it is designated on the following basic principles: viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into Regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial adjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Moslems are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India, should be grouped to constitute Independent States in which the Constituent Units shall be autonomous and sovereign.

This is not yet very clear, either in respect of the territories proposed, or of the kind of constitution intended ("independent States" with "sovereign" "Constituent Units"). But more recent statements of Mr. Jinnah have sharpened the definition. In an interview to Reuter's correspondent on December 10, 1945, Mr. Jinnah has defined the Moslem League claim:—

> *The deadlock in India is not so much between India and the British. It is between the Hindu Congress and the Moslem League.* . . . Nothing can or will be solved until Pakistan is granted. . . . There will have to be not one, but two Constitution-making bodies—one to frame and decide on the constitution of Hindustan and the other to frame and decide on the constitution of Pakistan. . . .
>
> We could settle the Indian problem in ten minutes if Mr. Gandhi would say: "I agree that there should be Pakistan. I agree that *one-fourth of India, composed of six Provinces—Sind, Baluchistan, the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Bengal and Assam—with their present boundaries, should constitute the Pakistan State.*"
>
> It is possible there will have to be an exchange of populations, if it can be done on a purely voluntary basis. There will also doubtless have to be frontier adjustments. . . . All that can come, but first it is necessary to take the present provincial borders as boundaries of the future Pakistan. Our Pakistan Government will probably be a federal Government modelled on the lines of autonomous provinces. . . .
>
> *I personally do not doubt the sincerity of the British Government.* But I do doubt the sincerity of those who profess to see

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any hope of a settlement outside the granting of full Pakistan to the Moslems of India. (Italics added.)

This represents an authoritative statement of the current Moslem League position. It will be seen that

(1) the Moslem League regards the main enemy, not as British imperialism, but as the National Congress;

(2) the Moslem League demands that the Sovereign State of Pakistan shall consist of the six British-demarcated Provinces, Sind, Baluchistan, the Punjab and N.W. Frontier Province in North-West India, and Bengal and Assam in North-East India, "with their present boundaries";

(3) this demarcation of these six Provinces as a separate State cut off from the rest of India shall be imposed by the present ruling Power, that is, by British imperialism, independent of and prior to any consultation of the wishes of the inhabitants of these Provinces.

With regard to the six Provinces designated to constitute Pakistan "with their present boundaries," it should be noted that the total population is 107 millions, of whom the Moslems constitute 59 millions, or 55 per cent. and the non-Moslems 48 millions or 45 per cent. Thus the non-Moslems would constitute nearly half of this "Moslem State," while 35 million Moslems, or nearly two-fifths of the Moslems in British India, would remain outside it. This illustrates the obvious limitations of any attempt to settle the communal question of the closely intermingled Hindu and Moslem population of India on an arbitrary territorial basis. Eastern Punjab is heavily non-Moslem; the Sikhs have proclaimed their vigorous resistance to inclusion in any Moslem State; Western Bengal, including Calcutta, is heavily non-Moslem; Assam has a non-Moslem majority; Sind, with a Moslem majority, has returned a majority of Congress supporters against the Moslem League in the elections; the North-West Frontier Province, overwhelmingly Moslem, is a Congress stronghold.

Is there any evidence that the majority of the population of these territories desire the establishment of a separate State of Pakistan rather than an All-India Federation? There is no evidence, and can be none, failing the holding of a plebiscite or similar means of ascertaining the wishes of the population. In the Gandhi-Jinnah conversations in the summer of 1944 this was the not unreasonable proposal of Mr. Gandhi. But a plebiscite or similar means of ascertaining the wishes of the population as a whole in the territories in question is precisely what Mr. Jinnah opposes. He demands that the separation must first take place by the action of the British Government without consulting the wishes of the population. He further demands that any plebiscite must be confined to the Moslem 55 per cent. of the population, which would mean that 28 per cent. of the population (51 per cent. of 55 per cent.) could determine the issue for the whole population.

It is obvious that no democrat could support these proposals. Whether there may or may not be a case for Pakistan must depend in the final resort on the wishes of the people concerned. But the demand for Pakistan, as presented by the Moslem League, by way of ultimatum irrespective of popular wishes, and with resistance to any democratic solution, becomes in practice a reactionary obstructive tactic which plays into the hands of imperialism to delay Indian independence and prevent a democratic solution of the Indian question.

This should not, however, blind us to the genuine national content concealed behind the Pakistan demand.

* * *

The Communist Party of India has the credit of having first discerned in 1942 the genuine national element concealed within the Pakistan demand and explaining its measure of support

REPRODUCED 2005 BY CNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among wide sections of Moslems. The Report of G. Adhikari in the autumn of 1942 (republished in this country by the LABOUR MONTHLY as a pamphlet under the title *Pakistan and National Unity*) made this valuable theoretical contribution to the understanding of the new problems arising in India.

Prior to this Report the Indian Communists, in common with the rest of progressive national opinion in India, laid the main emphasis on exposing the reactionary character of the Pakistan programme. Thus P. C. Joshi, the Secretary of the C.P.I., wrote in a pamphlet published in India in February, 1942 (republished in this country under the title *The Indian Communist Party*):—

Mr. Jinnah's dreamland of Pakistan (separate Moslem States) leads nowhere except to stalemate and sitting tight.

The Report of G. Adhikari brought out for the first time clearly the developing multi-national character of the Indian people, consequent on the wider mass extension of the national movement, especially among the peasantry, and showed the political conclusions which must be drawn from this:—

Every section of the Indian people which has a contiguous territory as its homeland, common historical tradition, common language, culture, psychological make-up and common economic life would be recognised as a distinct nationality with the right to exist as an autonomous state within the free Indian Union or Federation and will have the right to secede from it if it may so desire . . . Thus Free India of tomorrow would be a Federation or Union of autonomous states of the various nationalities, such as the Pathans, Western Punjabis (dominantly Moslems), Sikhs, Sindhis, Hindustanis, Rajasthanis, Gujeratis, Bengalis, Assamese, Beharis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamils, Karnatikis, Maharashtrians, Meralas, etc.

At the same time the Report and Resolution made clear that this right of self-determination did not mean the desirability of separation, but would lay the basis for "a greater and grander unity of India than our country has ever seen." The Report further emphasised the sharp distinction of this programme from the reactionary propaganda of Pakistan, with regard to which it stressed the necessity to

direct a sharp edge against those who use the existing inequalities to rally the masses under the banner of Pakistan, to pander to reactionary Pan-Islamic sentiment under the cover of old religious prejudices, to turn the masses away from the common freedom movement. . . . To the Moslem masses our explanation must be such as to disillusion them about Pakistan.

It should be noted (especially for the information of readers in Britain who have the first edition of this pamphlet) that in later editions of this Report this formulation in regard to Pakistan has been revised. In the more recent period the Communist Party of India has been concerned to present less sharply the distinction of its programme from the programme of Pakistan, and to stress rather that

the democratic core within the Pakistan demand, the core which the Moslem masses really demand, is the right of Moslem nationalities to self-determination.

(Revised edition of Adhikari's Report, 1944.)

Similarly P. C. Joshi, in his pamphlet *They Must Meet Again*, published in October, 1944, after the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah conversations, wrote:—

Right in our midst live Moslem peoples like the Sindhis, Baluchis, Pathans, Western Punjabis, Eastern Bengalis, and they have the necessary characteristics of nations. . . .

The Pakistan movement, under the banner of the League, is the national movement of these nationalities.

The tactical reasons for this sympathetic approach to the supporters of Pakistan among the Moslem masses in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to win them for the united all-India national front are understandable. But there is some danger of consequent misinterpretation of the position of the Indian Communists as supporters of "Pakistan" (meaning an idealised conception of "Pakistan" entirely at variance with the official programme of Pakistan put forward by the Moslem League), when in fact Pakistan means the official programme of the Moslem League and is basically opposed to the programme of national self-determination put forward by the Communist Party. This danger could be increased by some recent developments, as when approval was expressed of prominent left wing Congress Moslems, who hold leading official positions in the Congress and resigned those positions to join the Moslem League (which could easily be misinterpreted as equivalent to supporting the imperialist thesis of the Congress as a Hindu organisation and the Moslem League as the appropriate organisation for Moslems), or when the Communists judged it necessary to resign as a body from the Congress, following the right wing offensive against them, on the grounds of the reactionary character of the Congress leadership, while continuing active participation in the Moslem League (which could again be misinterpreted as equivalent to regarding the Congress as the relatively more reactionary body and the Moslem League as the relatively more progressive body of the national movement). These dangers could lead to a certain alienation from the wide sections of mass national opinion which see in the Congress the traditional main organisation of the national movement for independence, irrespective of communal and sectional divisions.

Hence it is essential to recognise clearly the constructive character of the contribution (exaggerations apart) which the Indian Communists have made to the problem of Indian national unity in relation to the multi-national character of the Indian people, and to distinguish this from the reactionary official Pakistan programme of the Moslem League.

First, the Pakistan programme makes no mention of the varied nationalities recognised by the Communist programme as having a claim to self-determination. The Pakistan programme is a programme for a Moslem State. The Communist Party calls for seventeen Constituent Assemblies, based on seventeen alleged nationalities. The Pakistan programme calls for two Constituent Assemblies, one for Hindu majority areas, and the other for Moslem majority areas.

Second, the Pakistan movement is not a federation of recognised national movements of nationalities. It is a movement of the Moslem League for the constitution of a Moslem State, with the determining factor as religion, not nationality.

Third, it is doubtful if it is correct to speak of "Moslem nationalities" any more than it would be to speak of Spain, Italy, France and Austria as "Catholic nationalities." The measure of religion is not identical with the measure of nationality (the example of Bengal, with a strong common Bengali feeling against partition, yet almost equally divided between Hindus and Moslems, is a case in point); and the identification is dangerous and plays into the hands of Pan-Islamism.

Fourth, the Moslem League is not a national movement of certain nationalities occupying certain parts of India. It is a communal organisation organising Moslems as Moslems in all parts of India, just as the Hindu Mahasabha organises Hindus as Hindus. Such communal organisation is a sign of political backwardness and carries obvious dangers of disruption.

REPRODUCED 2006 BY LIBCOM.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But this does not diminish the importance of winning the wide sections following the Moslem League to a broad united national front for Indian independence. It is here that the work of the Communist Party, in striving tirelessly for Congress-League unity, in approaching with sympathetic understanding the aspirations of the masses following the Moslem League, and in discerning the genuine national elements behind the Pakistan demand and showing the possible basis for an agreed solution between the Congress and the League, has performed a real service in the cause of Indian national unity.

* * *

Congress-League unity is of vital importance at the present time in order to enable the Indian people to present a united national front and defeat the attempts of imperialism to play on the divisions between organisations. Unfortunately, the attempts so far to achieve a common platform have been unsuccessful, largely owing to the clever manoeuvres of the third party, imperialism, to keep the division alive.

In the summer of last year agreement was reached between the parliamentary leaders of the National Congress and the Moslem League for the formation of a Provisional National Government, within the framework of the Viceroy's Executive Council, on the basis of parity between the Congress and the League. This agreement compelled Lord Wavell to leave for London to ask for advice. The India Office cleverly turned the formula inside out by accepting the proposal with a slight change, the substitution of "Hindu-Moslem parity" for "Congress-League parity." Thereby the issue was brought back to the basis of communal division. Either the Congress would have to withdraw its Moslem President from participation and accept a restriction of its position to that of a "Hindu" organisation (completely contrary to its non-communal principles), or by demanding one of the Moslem seats it would be destroying the agreed basis of parity between Congress and League. The trick was successful. In place of presenting a united front to reject the Amery formula and insist on the terms of their agreement, the leadership of both organisations fell into the trap and endeavoured to exploit the Amery formula for their own sectional advantage. The Simla conversations broke down, and the elections were conducted under conditions of accentuated hostility between the Congress and the League.

Despite the difficulties of the present position, it is obvious that every effort within the national movement should be directed towards the establishment of a united national front, which should draw in, not only the National Congress and the Moslem League as the two principal political organisations standing for the aim of Indian independence, but also the working-class and peasant organisations, the Communist Party, Trade Union Congress and Kisan (peasant) associations.

* * *

An additional difficulty of the present situation arises from the growth of division between the National Congress and the Communist Party. This reflects the sharpening of class contradictions in the present phase in India, which accompanies the advance of the national struggle for independence, as the goal of national independence begins to draw more closely within sight.

The Communist Party is the unchallenged leader of the Indian working-class and of the organised peasant movement. With 30,000 members today (as against 5,000 in 1942, when it won legality) it is the third political party in India, and the only party effectively uniting Hindus and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moslems within its ranks. It holds majority leadership within the Trade Union Congress and principal trade unions, whose membership has risen under its guidance from 196,000 at the beginning of 1943 to 600,000 today; and in the Kisan Sabhas (Peasant Associations) whose membership has risen from 226,000 in 1942 to 830,000 in 1944.

On the other hand, the Indian big capitalists have strengthened their position and piled up big profits from the war, not so much from increased production (the index of industrial production, on the basis of 1938-39 as 100, fell to 97.9 by 1942-43) as from the conditions of war finance and contracts, shortage and high prices, inflation and the black market. They see in the post-war phase a golden opportunity, with the weakening of British imperialism, and the possibility of playing on the antagonism between American and British capital, to break the stranglehold of British monopoly, win the leading position and enter on a course of profitable large-scale industrial development under a National Government.

The powerful influence of the biggest and most strongly established Indian capitalists (Tatas, Birla, etc.)* in the counsels of the top leadership of the National Congress, which has developed historically as the organ of the rising Indian capitalist class, although in the modern period reaching to a broad mass membership, has been strengthened with these new developments, and has been reflected in an increasingly dominant position of the right wing sections of the leadership (Patel, Prasad, Kripalani, etc.) and in a right wing anti-communist offensive.

Previously these sections tolerated the role of a minority of Communists and left wing mass representatives within the national movement as a useful lever of pressure on the Government. Now, with the new perspective, and with the closer approach to the prospect of governmental power, they look with a hostile eye on the growth of the Communist Party to a mass party and the extension of working-class and peasant organisation under its influence. They seek to organise separate Congress trade unions and Congress peasants' organisations, through which they preach the principles of docility of the worker to his employer and of the peasant to the landlord.

> A cultured worker, leading a pure and simple life and living on the sweat of his brow, can lead a life many times happier than that of the mill agent or any other rich persons."
>
> (Vallabhai Patel, quoted *Economist*, January 12, 1946.)

> The workers and peasants should be regarded as minors and wards. The rich landlords and factory owners are their guardians and trustees.
>
> (A. Kripalani, General Secretary of the National Congress, speech on December 5, 1945, to the Bengal Branch of the Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh, or Congress organisation for workers.)

The anti-communist offensive inaugurated by the right wing leadership last autumn sought to base itself on an indictment which made a series of very loose and prejudiced charges against the policy of the Communist Party during the war. The answer of the

* It is important to bear in mind the extremely narrow, concentrated and oligarchic character of Indian big capitalism:

> "Control is exercised, not only by a few trusts, but in the last resort by a few individuals. . . . 500 important industrial companies are managed by 2,000 directors. 1,000 of these directorships are held by 70 men. At the apex of this pyramid stand 10 men holding 300 directorships. This oligarchy in industry is a closed preserve. The son succeeds the father."
>
> (Wadia and Merchant, *Our Economic Problem*, Bombay, 1943, p. 481.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist Party has been published in a full statement, *Communist Reply to Congress Working Committee's Charges*, by P. C. Joshi, in two volumes, which constitutes a penetrating analysis of Indian politics during the war and a convincing and moving reply to these charges.

The All-India Congress Committee in October decided to disqualify Communists from holding official positions in the Congress, while leaving membership open to them.

In face of this offensive, the Communist Party decided to recommend its members to resign from membership of the Congress, in order to maintain their freedom to express their independent viewpoint.

It is to be hoped that this breach may be overcome at the earliest possible moment, in view of the paramount importance of national unity in the coming period. The National Congress has a long tradition as the main uniting body of all sections of Indian progressive nationalism. The overwhelming majority of the Indian people look to the National Congress as the leader of their struggle for freedom. It is of the greatest importance that effective co-operation in the common national struggle should be established between the National Congress and the rising force of the political working-class movement and of the peasants' movement, as well as of younger radical opinion, represented by the Communist Party.

* * *

In the face of these new developments and internal problems of the Indian situation, what should be the attitude of the Labour Government and democratic opinion in Britain? Can the argument be accepted that these divisions within the Indian political movement (all sections of which, be it noted, are at one in demanding Indian independence) make impossible the recognition of Indian independence and justify the maintenance of British rule?

On the contrary. This would be the old imperialist method of "Divide and Rule." The internal questions of the Indian people, and of the future state forms they wish to adopt, whether Pakistan or other, are questions for the Indian people to settle. They are not questions for the British people to settle or impose a settlement, any more than it would be suitable for the Indian people to determine the solution for the Scottish nationalist demand for Scottish self-government. Our task is to see that, on the basis of a democratically elected Constituent Assembly, the Indian people have the opportunity to determine their own future with complete freedom.

Official apologists often argue that the existing offer of Mr. Attlee and Lord Wavell, repeating the Churchill-Amery-Cripps offer of 1942, is equivalent to an offer of full independence and freedom of choice "if only the Indians can agree among themselves." Lord Pethick-Lawrence, replying to the Indian leaders' criticism of the Labour Government's offer, stated:—

> Self-government within the British Commonwealth carries with it the freedom of choice; no member of it is bound to another member by bonds other than those of mutual assent.

Similarly, the *Daily Herald* stated in an editorial, "We Mean Freedom" (September 25, 1945):—

> "India can achieve complete independence under the present plan."

This is incorrect. The present plan does not yet give the Indian people the opportunity to elect democratically their own representatives to determine their own future. Instead, it repeats the discredited method of the Round Table Conference, to draw together sectional representatives on a basis calculated to guarantee a picture of irreconcilable divisions, in order to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"prove" the necessity for the British rulers finally to step forward as arbiters and impose their own settlement. And it is worth noting that influential sections of imperialist opinion, as in Professor Coupland's semi-official Report, *The Future of India*, are preparing plans to partition India in British interests, with Hindu "Regions," Moslem "Regions," and a separate Dominion for the Princes, and an overall unifying agency. This would represent the final imperialist plan for the Ulsterisation of India in order to maintain British supremacy.

It is essential to awaken democratic opinion in this country to the danger of the present official policy, which still denies the right of self-determination to India, and hypocritically seeks to throw the blame on Indian divisions. While sympathetically following the new developments and internal problems of the Indian people in their painful advance to freedom, we do not require to set ourselves up as judges over them on these internal issues. Our task is to change the policy of our own Government, to campaign for the ending of imperialist rule in India and the recognition of Indian independence, and to see that concrete steps are taken to make this recognition effective. Such concrete steps should include

(1) Full civil liberties and release of political prisoners;

(2) Election of a sovereign Constituent Assembly (*a*) created by adult suffrage; (*b*) democratically elected equally for the Provinces of British India and for the States at present under the Princes; (*c*) with sovereign powers to determine the future constitution and government of India and regulate future relations with Britain.

In calling for a Constituent Assembly we do not pre-determine the question of one or more Constituent Assemblies. In the event of a united demand from the Congress and Moslem League for more than one Constituent Assembly, such an agreed basis should be automatically accepted. In the absence of such a united demand, it would be undemocratic for the British ruling Power to impose a decision and determine boundaries which could have the effect of forestalling the judgment of the Indian people on the issue. Hence under present conditions our cardinal demand in relation to India must be for the full recognition of Indian independence and the democratic election of a sovereign Constituent Assembly which will enable the Indian people to determine their own future.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 *months* 7*s. Postage paid Abroad,* 8*s., from LABOUR MONTHLY,* 134, *Ballards Lane, London, N.*3.

A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3*s. a year inclusive of postage.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Karl Marx

5th May, 1818—14th March, 1883

In March, 1846, a hundred years ago, Marx was working in Brussels, along with Engels, upon their book, *The German Ideology* published in full eighty-six years afterwards by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, Moscow. This was, as Marx said later, "in fact settling accounts with our erstwhile philosophic conscience."

In the same month Marx and Engels were writing to the Chartist leader G. J. Harvey in London, telling him of their plans for an organisation "on the basis of scientific communism." This took shape the next year as the Communist League, at whose second congress in London Marx and Engels were commissioned to draw up the famous Manifesto.

The following oft-quoted passage from it, under the heading "Proletarians and Communists," has a special relevance today and in this country:—

"They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

"They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: (1) In the national struggles of the proletariat of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. (2) In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working-class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

"The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

Small Beer Chronicles

The International Labour Movement by John Price (Oxford University Press) 1945, 273 pp., 15*s*).

AN IMMORTAL passage in Engels' *Revolution and Counter Revolution in Germany* speaks of "that incurable malady, parliamentary cretinism, a disorder which penetrates its unfortunate victims with the solemn conviction that the whole world, its history and future, are governed and determined by a majority of votes in that particular representative body which has the honour to count them among its members."

If Engels were alive today, he would have noticed a new variety of cretinism which attacks research workers, particularly in trade union offices, unless they are very careful. Mr. John Price presents an unmistakable and disastrous case of the ravages of this disease.

Passing in 1943, after six years in the Transport Workers' Union Research Department, to the International Labour Office, he has produced—with the help of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House)—a book on the international labour movement which is almost entirely devoted to the mutual relations of, and resolutions passed by, the officials of various Socialist parties and of various trade unions under Socialist leadership. Even bare references to the *movement* which elected these officials creep in very rarely, and by accident.

As a result, the book is not very unreadable. It does not even attempt to give (what would have been invaluable) an account, however summary, of the debates at the congresses of the International Federation of Trade Unions, or of the Trade Secretariats, or of the Labour and Socialist International—which are the only bodies taken within the purview of the book, for some reason presumably known at Chatham House or the I.L.O., those unchallenged authorities on what constitutes the labour movement.

For the same reason, when the book occasionally mentions the Communist Parties or the Soviet trade unions, it does so only to slander them—and that without the chapter and verse which sometimes makes even a hostile criticism useful as a source of reference.

In short, Mr. Price's book has a very limited value even for reference purposes. To some extent, of course, it may unconsciously help to explain why, after 1929, the organisations whose officials he so much admires (p. 23) " found themselves carried along more and more by events, with no opportunities for pursuing long-term policies." But it is not a study of the international labour movement.

A. R.

INDEX.

The Index for 1945 (ready shortly) will be sent free of charge to any reader sending a stamped, addressed foolscap envelope.

BOUND VOLUMES, 1945.

We must advise our readers that no further loose copies can be accepted for binding. All volumes are now in the hands of the Bookbinders and will be despatched as soon as ready.

A limited number of volumes for past years will also be available.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Pre-War Pole

Crossroads of Two Continents by Feliks Gross (Columbia University Press, 1945, 162 pp., $2.00).

MR. GROSS's work is frankly a plea for the old imperialist pre-war Poland, ruling Ukrainians and Byelorussians, and leader in addition of an Eastern and Central European Federation, stretching westwards to Austria and southwards to Greece. Moreover, although it tries hard to preserve the decent restraint of a university thesis, its anti-Soviet inspiration breaks out more than once. In these main respects, the book is very much behind the times.

But it contains in the appendices a convenient collection of diplomatic documents on various attempts at federation in that part of Europe during the last generation, which have played some part in the history of international relations, and also a most extensive bibliography.

Q.

Cambridge

Cambridge Today and Tomorrow (Cambridge Branch of Communist Party, 6*d*). THIS LARGE-PAGED, pictorial booklet may serve other towns as a model of what is needed. Its broad survey covers all fields and shows clearly the immediate possibilities for progressive advance. Incidentally, Cambridge as a university town has many special problems and these are seen clearly in the light of modern needs. It would have been useful to give more analysis of the workers directly or indirectly dependent on the university, because their status in the past has been responsible for the parasitic character of a large section of the Cambridge community.

C. P. D.

Literary Essays

The Language of Men by A. L. Morton (*Cobbett Press*, 7*s*6*d*, 94 pp.).

THE TITLE of Mr. Morton's book is taken from Milton's *Areopagitica*, "... Our English, the language of men ever famous and foremost in the achievements of liberty." This is the thread linking a dozen different literary essays, written over the last fifteen years. The subjects are diverse, the Border Ballads and the Negro Spiritual on the one side, Swift and Defoe on the other. But towards each, there is a similar approach, the evaluation of past or contemporary literature in terms of the period of its production and the social forces playing on the author.

Mr. Morton writes from a great love of literature and his Marxist approach is not mechanical. His study of E. M. Forster, written in 1932, may not be exactly as he would write it today. But all the essays are both simple and scholarly, sensitive and fresh.

The modern essays include studies of Lowes Dickinson, Housman and Chesterton; and of the others the most interesting are Bacon's New Atlantis and Charles Churchill: the Bear with the Ragged Staff.

A. C. M.

Shorter Notices

THIS JULY issue of the Pictorial Chart Service, *The Colonies. I. Africa*, is hardly up to the standard of previous charts.

The Governing of Men by Alexander H. Leighton, Princeton University Press (O.U.P.) $3.75, 404 pp.

This is a study of one of the relocation (internment) camps in U.S.A. where Japanese residents (citizens and non-citizens) were interned after Pearl Harbour.

A. C.

COPIES FOR THE FORCES

For the benefit of the armed forces, will readers who have finished with their copy, please return it to us at :—

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

On their behalf, THANK YOU !

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in February, 1946 : £82 : 9 : 9

	£	s.	d.
H. A. B.	5	0	0
A. Kay			9
Army Officer		6	0
J. Rattray		2	6
Subtenanto		2	6
S. Morrissy		10	0
D. H. Strathern and Friends		9	0
Second Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E.		10	0
Progressive Airman		5	0
P. Horton		13	0
C. Hasler		13	0
A. Wall		5	0
F. E. Stehr		10	0
F. Bradbury		2	6
J. Barrett		7	0
W. Schuller		5	0
G. Winspear		3	0
M. Merrall		13	0
T. Kerrigan		2	9
D. Baverstock		2	6
J. Given	2	0	0
E. Luce		3	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
G. Robson		5	0
J. Purton		10	0
O. R. S.		10	0
R. T. Chapman		3	0
K. Tatler		5	0
J. Trott		7	6
J. Hunter		3	0
J. Gibson		10	0
J. Gaunt		3	0
L. Spiegel		7	6
R. Bradley			6
J. C. Slater	1	0	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
D. Parvin		2	6
O C. Crane			6
Mr.& Mrs.Humphreys		2	6
A. F. Perrin		2	6
R. Green		3	0
F. Torr	1	0	0
M. Lane	1	0	0
D. Rees		10	0
A. Collindridge		3	0
M. Philibert		1	6
N. Macdonald		13	0
A. E., R.A.O.C.		10	0
J. B.		5	0
V.A.D.		5	0
G. H. Warrack		10	0
S. Oyston	1	13	0
Learner		2	0
Anon., Whitchurch		1	0
A. L. Beak		8	0
G. Morey		15	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
F. Sawyer	1	0	0
L. Drewitt		8	0
Director	2	0	0
A. A. Woolf		5	0
F. E. Stehr		5	0
S. Mayne		13	0
R. Anderson		12	6
B. Grundy		3	0
Naval Officer		10	0
Progressive Airman		5	0
R. Leadbetter		13	0
J. B. Hamilton		13	0
W. Kelsall		13	0
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
A. S. Garrido	1	4	0
R. Benians	3	0	0
B. Goldbloom		3	6
H. A. Percival		3	6
L. Youatt		14	0
V. Shelley		13	0
T. P. Castley		13	0
Demobbed Officer	5	0	0
S. Jones		3	6
A. S. Bacon		3	0
P. Bielschowsky	9	13	0
O. P. Hollander		10	0
W. H. Allen		14	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
P. Dodsworth		3	0
W. Stonard		3	0
R. Green		3	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
H. White		3	0
W. Jackson		1	0
H. O. Young		3	0
A. E. Pearson		3	0
F. Barker		3	0
V. Smith	1	0	0
C. Bloomfield		3	0
H. S. M.		2	6
J. Pack		5	0
M. W. Eve		13	0
L'Humanite		2	0
S. Datta		3	0
O. Mangeot		3	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
J. Marlin		3	0
E. D. McCallum		2	9
M. R. Mann		13	0
R. F. Chambers		3	0
The Bacon Family		5	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
L. Borsley		13	0
M. S. Rix		8	0
N. Kelly		6	0
W. K. Sutton		3	0
J. C. M'Alister		13	0
D.G. 10	2	10	0
L. Baldwin			6
Mr. & Mrs. E. Roberts		5	0
R. Johnson		3	0
D. Downie		3	0
K. D. Harding		5	0
J. A. Smith		2	6
N. E. Bell		13	0
W. M. Davies		14	0
Anonymous	1	0	0
Radio Mechanic, R.E.M.E.		10	0
A. Idle		13	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
H. McGeachan		1	0
E. Thomas		1	6
S. Mill		10	0
C. A. Giles		3	0
T. H. Coe		2	6
J. C. Walker		3	0
B. G. Stevens		2	6
E. Edinburgh D.G.		10	6
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
V. R. Pearson		2	6

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION

NAME..... ADDRESS.....

(Please use Block Capitals)

.....

.....

I am a regular reader of LABOUR MONTHLY and I wish to become a postal subscriber.

I enclose $\frac{7/\text{- (Home)}}{8/\text{- (Abroad)}}$ to cover 12 months' subscription beginning with the

.....issue.

(Strike out the words which do not apply).

Signed..... *Date*.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UMZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just Published

BRITISH SOLDIER IN GREECE

Colin Wright

Fully Illustrated *5s.*

LAWRENCE & WISHART

B.Sc. ECON.

Men and women who wish to prepare for post-war opportunities should obtain the London University B.Sc. Econ. degree. It is a valuable qualification not only for teaching or administrative posts under Education authorities, but also for statistical research and welfare work in commerce, industry, and T.U. organisation. The degree is open to all. Prepare for it at home under the experienced guidance of Wolsey Hall; tuition fees may be paid by instalments. At the 1945 (External) Exam. 36 out of 48 W. H. Students Passed, 21 in Honours.

Prospectus post free from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. JK17,

WOLSEY HALL, OXFORD

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY ?

by

WILLIAM GALLACHER, M.P.

PRICE 3d.

NOW ON SALE

Order from your bookshop or from

LABOUR MONTHLY,

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4, in the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT LAW
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED